DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 299 949 IR 013 462

AUTHOR Decker, Philip
TITLE Video-Pedagogy: A Catalyst for Group Discussion among Elementary School Children.
PUB DATE Jun 88
NOTE 59p.; Master of Arts in Latin American Studies Project, Stanford University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Master Theses (042) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Conflict Resolution; Day Care; Elementary Education; *Group Discussion; Hispanic Americans; *Interpersonal Communication; Program Evaluation; Student Attitudes; *Student Behavior; *Teaching Methods; *Videotape Cassettes

ABSTRACT

This pilot project explored the use of video in an elementary school as a catalyst for group discussion and self reflection in connection with conflict resolution. Subjects were 32 students in an extended day care program for grades K-6; 80% of these students were of Hispanic background. Videos were created with the students, and then played back to the same students, in order to discuss conflict resolution strategies. Discussion themes included: "working together versus not working together" and "the difference between rough play and fighting." When the students were surveyed on their reactions to the video project, they were generally positive about it, indicated that they enjoyed seeing themselves on video, and appeared to have absorbed many of the phrases used in the discussions, and possibly some of the lessons as well. Although the project was not designed to measure behavior change, one of the participating teachers seemed to believe that the video-discussions might have led to some behavior change. Eight appendices include a project calendar, discussion guides to tapes 1 and 2, a "shooting diary," excerpts from video-discussions, student project evaluation forms, a listing of student responses, and a teacher evaluation form with responses. (17 references) (EW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

1R

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

VIDEO-PEDAGOGY:

A CATALYST FOR GROUP DISCUSSION AMONG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL CHILDREN

ED299949

Philip Decker
Stanford University
June 1988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Philip Decker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR013462

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This paper details a pilot project that explores the use of video as a pedagogical tool in an elementary school, in Redwood City, California. The purpose of the project is to investigate how video can serve as a catalyst for small group discussion and self-reflection, for both students and teachers. Furthermore, the project investigates how video helps create a unique and exciting learning context. More specifically, videos were created with students, and then played back to the same students, in order to discuss strategies for conflict resolution. Discussion themes included: "working together versus not working together", and "the difference between rough play and fighting". In turn, I discuss: 1) literature on video-pedagogy; 2) the elementary school program; 3) videotaping procedures; 4) video-discussions; 5) project evaluation; and 6) further suggestions. I conducted this pilot project as an independent study for my Master's degree in Latin American Studies (with a concentration in Communications) at Stanford University.

PLEASE NOTE:

To respect the confidentiality of the children, **copies of the videotapes are not included with this paper**. However, the tapes are described in detail in this report.

To contact the author write to:

Philip Decker
2913 Old Dominion Blvd.
Alexandria, Virginia 22305

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

INTRODUCTION 1

HOOVER ELEMENTARY: EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM 1

A BRIEF LITERATURE REVIEW 2

VIDEOTAPING AT HOOVER: CORE CLASSES 6
- EQUIPMENT
- VIDEOTAPING PROCEDURE: MAKING THE RAW TAPES
- IMMEDIATE FEEDBACK

THE EDITED TAPES 8
- TAPE 1: WORKING TOGETHER VS. NOT WORKING TOGETHER
- TAPE 2: PLAYING VS. FIGHTING

VIDEO-DISCUSSIONS 12
- FORMING DISCUSSION GROUPS
- DISCUSSION SETTING
- DISCUSSION PROCEDURE
- OBSERVATIONS
- SOME KEY EXCERPTS (14)
- THE ROLE OF DISCUSSION MODERATOR (20)
- A FINAL "GOOD" LESSON
- BEHAVIOR CHANGE?

PROJECT EVALUATION 21

A FEW SUGGESTIONS 23

CONCLUSION 24

RELATED BIBLIOGRAPHY 25

APPENDIXES:

PROJECT CALENDAR	27
DISCUSSION GUIDE TO TAPE 1: (WORKING TOGETHER VS. NOT WORKING TOGETHER)	28
DISCUSSION GUIDE TO TAPE 2: (PLAYING VS. FIGHTING)	29
"SHOOTING DIARY"	30
EXCERPTS FROM VIDEO-DISCUSSIONS	36
STUDENT PROJECT EVALUATION FORM	48
STUDENT EVALUATION: RESPONSES	49
TEACHER PROJECT EVALUATION FORM WITH RESPONSES	52

INTRODUCTION

This paper details a pilot project that explores the use of video as a pedagogical tool in an elementary school. The purpose of the project is to investigate how video can serve as a catalyst for small group discussion and self-reflection, for both students and teachers. Furthermore, the project investigates how video helps create a unique and exciting learning context. In turn, I will discuss: 1) literature on video-pedagogy; 2) the elementary school program; 3) videotaping procedures; 4) video-discussions; 5) project evaluation; and 6) further suggestions. I conducted this pilot project as an independent study for my Master's degree in Latin American Studies (with a concentration in Communications) at Stanford University.

HOOVER ELEMENTARY: EXTENDED DAY PROGRAM

The project was conducted at Hoover Elementary School in Redwood City, California (about 30 miles south of San Francisco). The project's duration was one and a half months, from mid April to late May of 1988.

The video project was <u>not</u> incorporated into Hoover's regular teaching schedule. Instead, the video project was incorporated into Hoover's Extended Day Program (EDP). Like the video project, EDP was a pilot project as well, in its first year. EDP provided 69 students, grades K-6, with supervised, after-school services. The program was open to all kids, whose parents applied. Generally, parents enroll their children in EDP, because otherwise their children would be at home, unsupervised. EDP's stated program goals are to "focus on developing students' academic, social, and recreational skills in a structured learning environment." (Fernandez:1)

EDP lasts from 2:30 to 4:30, Monday through Thursday. Students choose their own "course" schedules. EDP "courses" include cooking, Mexican dance, outdoor games, arts and crafts, photography, tumbling, computers, handwriting, guitar, and mathematics.

In addition to the aforementioned courses, once a week, each kid attends a <u>CORE class</u>. In CORE class, students have "free play", supervised by two teachers -- EDP coordinator Gabriela, and EDP assistant coordinator America. In CORE class, students wander between different "stations" -- for drawing and painting, for playing board games, for doing homework, for working on special projects (such as making murals, playdough, paper chains).

The EDP teachers and myself decided to concentrate the video project within the CORE classes, since almost every kid attended CORE class at least one day a week, and since the CORE class's informal atmosphere offers excellent opportunities to tape the kids' play and social interactions.

Each CORE class meets for an hour, from 3:00 to 4:00. Approximately 10 to 12 children are in each CORE class. Monday and Thursday CORE classes are for children of grades K-3. Tuesday and Wednesday classes are for children of grades 4-6. All classes are co-ed.

About 80 percent of EDP students (and Hoover Elementary students) are Latino. In addition, there are a few Black, Oriental, and Anglo students. According to Gabriela, about half of the Latino students speak English fairly well. Being that Gabriela and America are both bilingual, conversation in EDP flowed smoothly between Spanish and English, . Needless to say, Hoover Elementary is located in a predominantly Latino neighborhood, tucked between warehouses and apartment complexes just off of Highway 101. Many of the neighborhood's residents are immigrants from Mexico.

This video project is not the first time that Hoover has incorporated video within their classes. The principal tells me that about one-third of the teachers regularly use video equipment in class instruction (to tape plays, to record discussions, to help with language training). However, what is new about this video project (to Hoover), is the use of video as a catalyst for discussion and self-reflection in small groups, to create a new, informal learning context. In addition, as we shall see, this video project employs tapes that were purposefully edited to serve as pedagogical tools for specific discussion themes.

A BRIEF LITERATURE REVIEW

In conducting a brief literature review, I found lots of information on the use of video in education; however, I found very little information on the use of video as a catalyst for group discussions in <u>elementary</u> school education.

None of the studies "hit the nail on the head". Instead, I found research that focuses on teacher training, on higher education, on language training, on speech training, on learning disabled students, on mental health patients, and on non-formal education for development projects. (Refer to related bibliography on page 25.)

Yet several sources <u>are</u> relevant to this study. Kaplan's <u>Video in the Classroom: A Guide to Creative Television</u> offers a valuable array of ideas for student-created video projects in elementary and secondary schools. But Kaplan's book is a guide <u>to</u> video projects, not an analysis <u>of</u> video projects.

In <u>Talking to Learn: Improving Teaching and Learning in Small Groups</u>, (by Abercrombie and Terry) and in <u>Video in Higher Education</u> (edited by Zuber-Skerritt), the authors <u>do</u> analyse video projects aimed at promoting group discussion and self-reflection. Nevertheless, it is difficult to apply their studies to elementary school kids, since their studies were conducted with

university students and teachers.

Greelis and Haarmann's book, The ABC's of Video Therapy, is extremely helpful. It does deal specifically with the use of video as a tool for discussion (and for promoting behavior change), with elementary school children. However, this book concentrates on case studies of video-pedagogy for children who are learning disabled, and developmentally disabled. Thus, once again, generalizability to Hoover Elementary's EDP program is difficult.

Despite the fact that the literature doesn't "hit the nail on the head", the literature is still very useful. It is clear that a precedent has been set for the use of video as a catalyst for discussion and self-reflection in a variety of school activities and levels. Furthermore, the literature does provide us with a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of video (as a pedagogical tool), regardless of the age or grade level of the video viewers.

Here I will briefly summarize some video-strengths recognized in the video-for-education literature. In Video Production in Education and Training, Elliott lists many characteristics of video that contribute to its role in education:

a) Information can be presented in a visually effective way.
b) Videotape is re-usable ....
c) [Videotape] can be played back immediately.
d) Existing audio-visual, graphic, and other materials can easily be incorporated into a video production.
e) ... [P]rogram copies ... can be viewed at home.
f) Video production incorporates many different tasks, which many find interesting and enjoyable.
g) Programs can be updated and re-edited relatively easily.
h) Dual soundtracks enable foreign language ... voice-overs.
i) Impressive results have been attained where video programs have been used as part of a campaign to influence behavior.
j) Since video production is best achieved by teamwork, preparing educational materials for a program encourages staff to work together.
k) A video production provides a tangible product for educators.... Its effectiveness can be monitored and the results incorporated in planning future activity.

l) Programs and sequences can be replayed an many times as the student needs or requires. (Elliott:12,13)

Zuber-Skerritt's discussion of video in higher education outlines the following four video-strengths: 1) instantaneous distribution of picture and sound to many viewers; 2) control over viewpoint by changing camera

angles, lighting conditions, focus, etc.; 3) ability to manipulate time through video replay, slow motion, freeze frames, and time lapse; and 4) capacity to assemble heterogeneous material into a coherent whole, bringing together video segments with photos, charts, graphs, drawings, speech, music. (Zuber-Skerritt:14-16)

Greelis feels that video is especially suited as a pedagogical tool, since video provides an "accelerated learning experience", and "holds attention". (Greelis:v) In addition, like many other researchers, Greelis notes that video enables students to view themselves, so that the students themselves become the models for desired learning goals. (Greelis:7) Finally, according to Greelis, video offers us the "rewarding nature of self-viewing of television". (Greelis:42)

Despite such praise for video as an educational tool, it's important to mention that not all researchers are convinced of video's merits. Video-for-education researchers are carrying on a key debate over the following questions: Is viewing oneself on video always rewarding? Are there potential risks of self-confrontation through video? Which images of themselves should students see? "Good" and "bad" behavior? Or only "good" behavior?

In his research on video self-confrontation for students in university speech classes, Kinzer cautions us:

> "video playback of classroom assignments is potentially harmful to those students who are communication apprehensive, shy, or unassertive ... Video feedback focuses attention on self and magnifies communication performance difficulties [which] might increase fear of communication, reinforce negative self-perceptions, and further reduce self-esteem and expectations of success in communication.... Generally, research suggests that for most students feedback increases satisfaction with instruction, increases interest, and facilitates learning. However, for some students feedback -- especially feedback perceived to be evaluative -- generates excessive anxiety which interferes with learning and with desire to continue instruction." (Kinzer:3,4)

More succinctly, according to Kinzer, through video self-confrontation "the private domain has painfully become public." (Kinzer:19)

In their research on the use of video in psychological treatment settings, Hosford and Mills also offer relevant warnings about the impact of video self-confrontation:

> "...unconscious communication is brought to awareness. Also, the degree of physical attractiveness (or lack thereof) likewise is brought in full view. It follows that there may be

two quite distinct reactions to video self-confrontation, depending upon whether persons like or dislike the image they see."(Hosford and Mills:136)

Based on these reservations about video self-confrontation, and based on behaviorist theory of behavior modelling, Hosford and Mills suggest that "only *appropriate* social behaviors should be presented" in educational videos. (Hosford and Mills:131) Similarly, based also on behaviorist theory, Greelis advocates that "students must be presented with correct self-models of desired learning objectives and behavior". (Greelis:5)

But on the other hand, some researchers argue that video self-confrontation -- even of "incorrect" behavior models -- may not cause harm; rather, it may be helpful. For instance, Zuber-Skerritt is optimistic about video self-confrontation, even if it's "difficult" for some students:

> "in our attempts to reduce arousal, stress, and anxiety we may forget that they are necessary elements in any change process and that behavior cannot be changed without experiencing them in some degree... [Arousal, stress, and some degree of anxiety] could also be seen as positive elements necessary for human growth." (Zuber-Skerritt:118)

In a similar vein, Kaplan (who has done considerable work with video specifically in elementary and secondary schools) sees potential in including "negative" behavior in video self-confrontation:

> "Exercises that enable students to see themselves as others see them, to realize their positive *and negative* values within a *supportive* atmosphere, to heighten awareness of internalized emotions, and to understand how their actions affect others should not present problems beyond the teacher's control." (Kaplan:90; italics added)

In sum, this brief review of the video-for-education literature can offer us some practical guidance. We must recognize that video self-confrontation is not necessarily fun for everyone. Seeing oneself on video can possibly, (with certain students and teachers under certain circumstances), have detrimental effects. Therefore, we must remain sensitive to videotaping and replaying the "negative" behavior of students. We must make certain that the videos are created, viewed, and discussed in a supportive, loving environment.

VIDEOTAPING AT HOOVER EDP: CORE CLASSES

EQUIPMENT:

To videotape CORE class sessions, I used Hoover Elementary's Panasonic 1/2 inch portable video equipment. In addition, Hoover has videocassette recorders and monitors for replaying the videos. Hoover has no editing equipment; therefore, in order to edit the videos, I used editing facilities at Stanford University. The images produced on the 1/2 inch video equipment were definitely of sufficient quality for editing and replaying the videotapes. It was not at all necessary to improve image quality by upgrading to 3/4 inch equipment.

For sound recording, I used the built-in microphone on the camera. At times it was difficult to pick-up conversations, due to the often high level of "noise" in the classroom, and to the collage of conversations occurring in many directions at the same time. It was much easier to pick up conversations when I was close to the "subjects". If I was standing far back, using the zoom lens, conversations got lost in the crowd.

I did not use a tripod during videotaping. Instead, I was always roaming around the room with the camera on my shoulder. Oftentimes I "walked" around on my knees, to videotape the class from the kids' perspective.

VIDEOTAPING PROCEDURE: MAKING THE RAW TAPES

I taped seven CORE class sessions (April 25,26,27,28 and May 2,4,5). (See project calendar on page 27.) On the first day, Gabriela introduced me to the students as a friend of hers -- not as a teacher. I explained to the kids that I wanted to work with them, to make videos of them -- videos that we would then see and discuss.

Before videotaping any classes, I had several discussions with Gabriela and America, to brainstorm on "what we should videotape" and on "what we should do with the videotapes". But, since all of us were new to this, we didn't come up with a specific, detailed "video curriculum". Without a concrete plan, I decided to explore and portray various general relationships: teacher-student; student-student; younger kids-older kids; boys-girls; Latino-Anglo; etc.. I had faith that with some time, and with careful observation, significant themes for video-discussions would emerge.

While taping CORE classes, I roamed around the room, looking for significant social ("play") interactions. From the start, the kids didn't seem to mind my videotaping them. Few students were very self-conscious. The camera blended in, rather easily. A few kids always hammed it up whenever I came near them with the camera. However, I made a point of not taking their pictures while they jumped in front of the camera; I explained that I would take their picture if they went back to playing what they were playing. This strategy usually worked.

I tried to capture a variety of class activities: kids drawing, playing board games, doing homework, running around. In addition, I taped kids working alone and kids working together. But I tried to dig "deeper" than just taping activities; I tried to tape the social interactions that the activities are embedded in. I especially focused on taping the kids as they "negotiated" with eachother -- trying to enter into group games, resolving conflicts, sharing (or not sharing) toys. During each CORE class, I tried to capture images of each kid "at his/her best". I looked for close-up shots of each kid involved in a creative process, concentrating hard on his/her work, -- as they painted, calculated, cut, stapled, figured out their next move at checkers, etc.. I took great interest in taping the kids' artwork. Further, I often taped how teachers interacted with students. In general, I videotaped all over the place, responding to whatever was going on. (For a more details on taping procedure, refer to my "shooting diary" on page 30.)

IMMEDIATE PLAYBACK:

At the end of three of the CORE classes (April 26,27,28), I showed the raw tapes right back to the kids that I had just made the tapes of. To view the tapes, we went across a courtyard and into the empty library, where I had the video monitor and recorder already set up. The kids sat on the floor to watch themselves. I played the tape from beginning to end, without interruption. The raw tapes averaged about 15 minutes in duration, per CORE class.

The kids were very excited (almost "too" excited). At first, they laughed for several minutes, calling out to eachother, as they and/or their friends showed up on the television screen. The laughter slowly subsided, and then broke out again, here and there. But the laughter was often "nervous laughter". I think that the kids were both fascinated and a bit uncomfortable to see themselves. Some kids hid their head when they showed up on the screen, while others yelled out "Look at me! Look at me!". Kids would often re-enact the activity in the video -- especially the video segments of boys play-fighting. In general, I think the girls were willing to more patiently watch the videos, whereas the boys more likely to be cracking-up.

Once the raw videos were over, we did not initiate any in depth discussions about the videos. These "immediate playback" sessions were designed primarily to acquaint kids with seeing themselves on videotape, and to assess whether or not they were interested in seeing themselves. All in all, it seemed to be a very exciting experience for them.

On Monday April 25, I did <u>not</u> immediately replay the tape of the CORE class to that class, at the end of the day. Instead, on the following Monday, May 2, I showed to the CORE class the tape that I made of them on April 25. I was interested to see how they would react to a tape of themselves that is a week-old. As expected, the response to the week-old tape was much less

intense, than the response of CORE classes who saw tapes of themselves that were shot and replayed during the same afternoon. The week-old tapes elicited quieter laughter, and less "acting out". For the kids, the week-old tapes were more "objective"; the kids weren't still wrapped up in the emotions and memories of what they did a week ago.

A few times, the teachers viewed the raw tapes on their own. This enables the teachers to critique their own teaching, and to view classroom activities and dynamics that occurred "behind their backs". The videos became an extra set of eyes for the teacher.

After each CORE class had viewed an immediate playback of the raw tapes of themselves, it did not make sense to repeat the same process, for another week. The novelty of the immediate playback would wear off. Further, the immediate playback tapes were not suited for planned, purposeful discussions. So we decided to try a different video activity: with the use of short, purposefully edited videotapes, we conducted focused, small group discussions on specific themes.

THE EDITED TAPES

I consulted with Gabriela to brainstorm on various themes that would be appropriate and useful for video-discussions. We decided to explore some of the following themes: emotions; the individual creative process; problem solving; and working together. However, since we didn't conceive of the themes for discussion before I taped the class sessions, the feasible discussion themes greatly depended on the material that happened to be in the raw tapes.[1] Finally, we decided to create two edited tapes for video-discussions -- one on "working together versus not working together", and one on "playing rough versus fighting". Below, before I discuss how the tapes served as pedagogical tools, I will detail how the edited tapes were created, and what the edited tapes depict.

TAPE 1: WORKING TOGETHER VERSUS NOT WORKING TOGETHER

In the editing room, I viewed the raw tapes several times, making a log of the most significant interactions related to the theme of "working together". Then, I created a first-generation tape[2], that grouped together (from all the raw tapes) all the significant interactions where kids are, and are not, working well together. From this first-generation tape of selected,

[1] In future projects, it is advisable to decide on topics before taping begins. (We were all new to this.) On the other hand, there is something to be gained from letting the videographer "go in cold", and respond visually to the classroom, without preconceived notions and agendas.

[2] A first-generation tape refers to the first copy made from the raw, master tape. A second-generation tape is a copy made from the first-generation tape.

interactions, I made a final edit -- a second-generation tape of purposefully juxtaposed interactions of "working together" and "not working together". This second-generation tape became the pedagogical tool used for our first video-discussion.

The "working together" tape consists of four pairs of juxtaposed interactions. Each pair begins with an interaction that depicts kids "working together", and ends with an interaction that depicts kids "not working together".

The tapes are brief. Each pair of interactions is approximately 30 seconds. So, the final tapes are only a few minutes long.

The tape is designed to enable kids to discriminate between "working together" and "not working together", to reinforce the differences, and to serve as a catalyst for discussion about conflict resolution. The video-discussion moderator stops the tape after each pair. However, the moderator can also replay the pair, or one of the interactions within each pair. (For a guide to Tape 1, see page 28.)

PAIR 1: Checkers versus Iceman

The first interaction in this pair depicts two children playing checkers, while three other children quietly watch and learn. Everyone is concentrating hard on the game.

The second interaction of this pair depicts children quarreling about who will get the next turn to play "Iceman" (a game whereby kids use plastic mallets to knock out plastic "ice cubes" that are suspended in a raised platform; the player who knocks out the last "ice cubes" loses). In this "Iceman" interaction, kids fight over the mallets, and over who will get to play next. Finally, to "resolve" the conflict, one boy "jokingly" threatens to beat up another boy. Like the checkers interaction, the "Iceman" interaction involves a group of several children.

PAIR 2: Spirograph

In the first interaction, three girls (K, M, and A) are making designs with Spirograph drawing tools. One girl, K, becomes fascinated with the design that her friend, M, has made. K asks M, "How did you do that?", showing a genuine interest to learn and to share experiences. K even affectionately pokes M's cheek.

The second interaction involves the same girls, only a few minutes later, still playing Spirograph. But by now, they are no longer working together. M claims that K has "her" drawing tool. So M takes it back from K. Then, in frustration, K takes A's drawing tool. And finally, A takes her drawing tool back from K. They all grab and swap the Spirograph drawing tools, without asking eachother for permission.

This pair reinforces the difference between working together and not working together. But moreover, this pair illustrates how the same people doing the same activity can evolve from "working together" to "not working together".

PAIR 3: Making a Paper Chain versus Folding a Tumbling Mat

In the first interaction, two girls are seated on the floor, helping eachother complete an enormously long and colorful paper chain. Both girls are working well together, in silence.

The second interaction also involves two kids. Here two boys (T and J) are trying to re-fold a tumbling mat. T starts out trying to fold the mat by himself -- with little success. So, J comes by to "help out". J starts to shout directions, "Fold it from the back side. Like this." Instead of going along with J's commands, T starts laughing, drops the mat, and calls out, "What?". Finally, with T just standing by, J kicks the mat to get it folded. Afterwards, both T and J collapse on top of it, yelling and laughing at eachother, at the same time.

PAIR 4: Parachute versus Washing Hands

This pair brings us back to large groups. In the first interaction, about a dozen children are outdoors on a bright, windy day, playing "cat and mouse" under a enormous rainbow-colored parachute. The kids are laughing and obviously having loads of fun. They are working together to secure the parachute, and to elect "cats" and "mice".

In the second interaction, about a dozen kids are struggling to wash their chalk-covered hands at one water faucet. They are all pushing and shoving, reaching over eachother for towels. They address eachother in annoyed, loud voices. The teacher comes over to help distribute towels and to encourage more cooperation.

TAPE 2: PLAYING ROUGH VERSUS FIGHTING

I created Tape 2 in the same way that I created Tape 1. I edited the raw tapes to create a first-generation tape that grouped all the significant interactions of kids that are playing rough and fighting. Then, from this first-generation tape, I made a final edit (a second-generation tape) of purposefully arranged interactions of kids "playing rough" and "fighting".

Unlike Tape 1, Tape 2 does not consist of simply juxtaposing "good" and "bad" interactions. Tape 2 offers no clear "pattern" (as did Tape 1) so that kids concentrate on the discussion theme, instead of trying to identify the pattern of this "new" tape. In addition, there is no simple "pattern" since Tape 2 is designed for kids to grapple with the fine line between playing rough and fighting. To zero in on this "fine line", the tape illustrates how a situation can start as "playing rough", yet evolve into "fighting".

Like Tape 1, in using Tape 2 for discussion, the moderator usually stops the tape after each pair. However, the moderator can replay the pair, or interactions within each pair. (For a guide to Tape 2, see page 29.)

Like Tape 1, each pair in Tape 2 lasts less than 30 seconds; thus, the whole tape (if played straight through) would be only a few minutes long.

PAIR 1: Girls Messing Around and Boys Messing Around

In the first interaction, a few girls are running around the classroom. They are smiling and laughing. One girl throws her coat on top of her friends head. It is pure play.

The second interaction consists of three boys play fighting They are obviously hamming it up in front of the camera. The boys even look straight at the camera as they punch away and pull on eachother, in slow motion. They all wind up on the floor in a ridiculous, laughing heap. Here rough play is definitely <u>not</u> fighting.

PAIR 2: Swinging turns into Pushing

In the first interaction, two young girls are holding hands and swinging eachother's arms through the air. They are singing and dancing together.

Then, in the second interaction we see the <u>same</u> two girls, a few minutes later, once they have been joined by another girl. All three girls are pulling eachother around the classroom. Then, a young boy tries to join the game. He grabs the waist of one of the girls. She starts pushing him away. The game is over. We see how "playing rough" evolved into "fighting".

PAIR 3: Play-Tugging becomes Trying to Pull Away

In the first interaction, two young boys are face to face, with all four hands locked; they each lean back and pull on eachother, playfully testing their strength.

The second interaction shows what happens to the <u>same</u> boys a few minutes later. The smaller boy is trying to free himself from the larger boy. They are no longer looking at eachother face to face. The smaller boy says, "Let my arm go". He is obviously uncomfortable, if not afraid of being hurt. After this plea, the larger boy does let the smaller boy's arm free. Like Pair 2, Pair 3 shows how playing rough can evolve into fighting. But unlike the kids depicted in Pair 2, the boys in Pair 3 <u>do</u> quickly resolve their conflict.

PAIR 4: J and T, then, J and L

In the first interaction, J and T are both threatening eachother with their fists. However, J has a serious face, whereas T is laughing. It is hard to tell if this is play or fighting. In addition, what is playing for T, may be fighting for J.

The second interaction is more clear cut. We see J intimidating a younger boy, L. J uses his chest to keep shoving L farther back into a corner of the room. L is not comfortable. His arms are crossed over his chest to protect himself; he is trying to get away.

VIDEO-DISCUSSIONS

FORMING DISCUSSION GROUPS:

Due to practical time limitations, we decided to conduct video-discussions with only the Wednesday and Thursday CORE classes. "Conveniently", the kids in Wednesday CORE class are in grades K-3, and the kids in Thursday CORE class are in grades 4-6.

To view the edited videos-for-discussion, Gabriela decided to split each CORE class (of approximately 10 kids) into two groups (of about 5 kids per group). An intimate discussion with 10 kids would be difficult. Not everyone would have a chance to participate. Furthermore, if all 10 kids were together, we feared that the kids would break out in nervous laughter like they did during the immediate playback sessions. We wanted to create an atmosphere where the kids could settle down to calmly discuss the videos' themes.

Thus, Wednesday CORE class was divided into Group A and Group B; Thursday CORE class was divided into Group C and Group D. (Remember, each group has about 5 kids.) Gabriela decided which kids would belong to which group. Kids with a history of "acting-up" together were separated. Also, kids who appear in conflict together in the edited videos were separated, so that they could discuss the videos without "intimidation".

For the first week of video-discussions (on Wed., May 11 and Thurs., May 12), all four groups viewed and discussed Tape 1, on "working together versus not working together". For the second week of video-discussions (on Wed., May 18 and Thurs., May 19), all four groups viewed and discussed Tape 2, on "playing versus fighting".

DISCUSSION SETTING:

To conduct the video-discussions, Gabriela led each group out of the CORE classroom, across a courtyard, and into the empty library. Fortunately, each CORE class has <u>two</u> teachers, so that while one group is engaged in a video-discussion at the library, the other group is still being supervised back in the CORE classroom.

By the time that Gabriela arrived with a group, it was crucial that I <u>already</u> had the library arranged for the video-discussion. To elicit open discussion, it was important for the atmosphere to be quiet, comfortable, and intimate. The large television monitor and videocassette player were

placed close to the floor on low footstools. The monitor was in a corner, so that the kids and teacher would be close together, and so that the kids could more easily focus their attention on the video, without their views straying across the room. No other competing activity or "noise" was occurring in the library. Gabriela sat on the floor by the side of the monitor. The kids were asked to form a small semi-circle in front of Garbiela and the monitor. Since the library was carpeted, the kids were comfortable on the floor. Most lied down on their stomachs, with their hands propping up their heads, ready to watch. All the overhead lights were left off; the window light and the light from the television were sufficient, and much softer.

DISCUSSION PROCEDURE:

Gabriela quickly viewed the edited tapes before carrying out the video-discussions. I provided general "instructions" as to how to use the edited tapes: where to stop the tape (after each interaction pair); the key questions addressed by each interaction pair; significant conversations or gestures to focus on.

Since Gabriela didn't have much time to practice using the tapes before conducting the video-discussions, I created a schematic guide for each tape, to assist Gabriela as the tape and the discussion evolved. Usually, once Gabriela gained experience conducting a couple video-discussions with a particular tape, the guide was no longer necessary. The videotape itself, became the "discussion guide". (See copies of the tape guides on pages 28 and 29.)

First, once everyone was seated and settled, Gabriela would introduce the theme of the day: "Today we're going to watch a video, and try to see if we can tell when people are working together, and when they're not working together"; or "Today we're going to watch and discuss a video. Try to see if you can tell when people are playing rough and when they are fighting."

Then Gabriela would show the first interaction pair, stop the video, and begin the discussion. Throughout the "breaks" between interaction pairs, Gabriela would initiate a discussion with the following types of questions: "What happened?"; "How do you think _____ feels here?"; How would you feel in a similar situation?.

At the end of the edited video, Gabriela would wrap up the discussion by discussing strategies for conflict-resolution. She would ask questions such as: "What could _____ have done differently to make the situation better?"; How could <u>you</u> help make a similar situation better?.

Oftentimes, to clarify or reinforce the discussion, Gabriela would replay an interaction pair, or one of the interactions in a pair. With the video, she was able to direct the kids' attention at especially revealing gestures, facial expressions, bits of dialogue. So, the tape was fluidly used in many "directions"; instead of showing the video from beginning to end (with pauses after each interaction pair), Gabriela could go forward, back a bit,

back some more, forward, back again, forward, forward, back to an earlier pair of interactions, focus on a bit of dialogue, play the dialogue again, focus on a facial gesture, go forward, back, forward, etc.. In short, the video became well integrated within the discussion process. The kids didn't just watch a video and then talk about it; instead, the video was like "scratch paper", deeply embedded within the flow of the discussion. The discussion wasn't just about the video; the discussion was with the video.

OBSERVATIONS:

By and large, the students were very interested and engaged in the video-discussions. However, I noticed that they were more interested in the first week's video-discussions than in the second week's video-discussions. This may be due to the subject matter of the videos, or the declining "novelty" of video-viewing by the second week.

Nonetheless, the video-discussions were quite successful. To varying degrees, all the kids participated in the discussions, even kids who usually don't ever quiet down and talk "seriously". The discussions provided a unique, supportive learning context for kids to express their thoughts and feelings, to grapple with value questions, and to suggest strategies for conflict resolution. As Gabriela remarks, "[The video-discussions] allowed [the kids] to discuss problem-solving techniques when they were calm (instead of being in the heat of the problem)." For the students who appeared in the edited video tapes, the video-discussions also offered them an opportunity for self-reflection.

Further, I believe that such lengthy and "deep" discussions about values and conflicts would not have been possible without the videos -- if, for instance, Gabriela took a group of kids into a room to just talk about (not view) the discussion themes. The videotapes focused the kids' attention, and provided concrete, visual realities to analyse and discuss.

SOME KEY EXCERPTS:

To get a better idea of how the video-discussions can work, what follows are some excerpts from the video-discussions conducted by Gabriela, with small groups of kids. In the following dialogues, a "K" is used to indicate when any "kid" in the group is speaking. Unless it is necessary for the understanding of the dialogue, the kid who is speaking will not be identified. (For more video-discussion excerpts, refer to page 36.)

In the next excerpt, the video enables students to focus on significant images that guide the discussion:

From Tape 2: Pair 4: J and T, then, J and L

G: (G plays both segments.) Playing of fighting?

KIDS: Playing. Fighting. Playing.

G: Look at peoples' faces to tell what's going on. (G replays first segment, J and T making fists at eachother.)

K: T was smiling, but J had a mad face.

G: Let's see it again. (G replays J and T segment.)

K: T was laughing, but J wasn't having fun. J was getting annoyed.

G: Were both having fun?

K: One was.

G: Was the other.

K: No.

G: How could you tell.

K: Their facial expressions.

In the next excerpt, we see how the video-discussion helped students brainstorm on strategies for conflict resolution:

From Tape 1: Pair 4: Washing Hands

G: What happened when everyone wanted to wash at once?

K: They got mad.

G: What could they have done different?

K: Waited.

G: And if it's hard to wait?

K: One person could hold the water for another to wash their hands.

As another example:

From Tape 2: Discussion Wrap-Up

G: In some of these [segments] we say fighting. But some were playing. It's hard to tell the difference sometimes. How can you tell the difference?

K: Facial expressions.

K: The way they use their hands.

K: Sometimes it looks like they are laughing, but they are really angry.

K: When playing you are happy. When fighting you are scared. You don't know why the other wants to fight you.

G: (G rewinds and replays the whole tape, as kids point out "playing" and "fighting" in each segment.) What can you do if you start playing and then its not fun anymore, if it starts to turn into fighting?

K: Tell the person not to do it. If that doesn't work, go tell the teacher.

K: Go away from him.

And still another example of video-discussions about conflict resolution:

Tape 2; Pair 2: J and T, then, J and L

G: (G plays first segment, of J and T.) What did their faces look like?

K: One was happy and one was sad.

G: So are they playing or fighting?

K: One was having fun and the other one wasn't.

G: (G plays the second segment of J pushing L.) What's happening with J and L?

KIDS: Fighting. Fighting.

K: No, they're just pushing.

G: What tells you if kids are playing or fighting?

K: On their face.

K: Tone of voice.

G: (Replays most of the segments.) If you start playing and it turns into a fight, what can you do?

K: Stop it.

G: How?

K: Get away from them.

K: Hold them down.

K: Tell the teacher.

K: Say, "No fighting!"

In addition to being a fine catalyst for general discussion, the video can facilitate discussions for <u>self-reflection</u>, since kids can talk about video segments in which they <u>themselves</u> appear. For example, in the following

excerpt, three girls discuss an argument they had (captured on video) over Spirograph drawing tools.

From Tape 1: Pair 2: Spirograph

G: (G plays the spirograph segments.) What happened?

M: (M, H, and A are all in the spirograph video segments.) She took mine, then H took it, but I was using it. (nervous laugh.)

H: I was letting her borrow it.

A: Because H was using hers.

G: Were you guys working together?

H: Not really.

G: I'll play it again. Look closely to tell when you're working together and not working together. See if you can notice the difference. (G replays the first segment, when they're working together.)

G: So right there, what was happening? Are you working together?

M: In the first part "yeah", but later on "no".

G: Then are you working together?

M, H, and A: (together) Yeah. No. Yeah.

G: Want to see the rest of it? (G replays second Spirograph segment, when the girls aren't working together.) What happened there?

M: We were all fighting for the same thing.

G: What could you have done different?

K: Sharing.

K: Wait for someone to finish and then give it to them.

However, note that in the following excerpt, a kid is uncomfortable discussing his own behavior depicted in the video. J wouldn't join in the conversation about himself:

From Tape 1: Pair 1: Checkers versus Iceman

G: We're going to see children playing together and not playing together. Look at their faces. Think about how they're feeling. (G shows first two segments.)

G: Who was playing? Want to see it again? (G replays Checkers segment.)

K: Happy!

K: Playing checkers.

G: Were people having fun?

KIDS: Yeah! Yeah!

G: What were they feeling? "J", how were you feeling? ("J" is in the Checkers segment.)

J: Happy.

G: (G replays the next segment, Iceman, in which J is aggressively trying to enter into a game, unsuccesfully.) What happened?

K: T said, "I'm gonna beat you up!".

K: I said, "I'm gonna beat you up!"

G: No, T said it. Let see. Watch carefully. (G replays Iceman segment.) Look at how they're playing. Were they happy?

KIDS: NO. NO. NO.

G: Were people playing together?

KIDS: NO. NO. NO.

K: They were fighting.

G: Why were they fighting?

K: They all wanted to play "the ice".

K: They could have waited.

K: They could play something else.

K: Take turns.

G: If you were there, what would you have said?

K: I don't know.

G: Were they sharing the hammers?

KIDS: NO. NO.

G: J, it's important that you join us in our discussion.

Once again, in the following excerpt, J shows unwillingness to actively participate in a discussion of a video segment that includes him:

Tape 1; Pair 3: Folding Tumbling Mat

G: What's J trying to do?

K: Fold it up.

G: What's T doing?

K: Helping.

G: Is he helping?

KIDS: No he's not. No. No.

G: Let's watch. (G replays segment.)

K: He's not helping right now.

G: Are they having a good time?

KIDS: Nope. No. No.

K: T wasn't helping J.

G: What could T have done differently?

J: Go away.

G: (to J) How could you have gotten T to go away?

J: Say, "GO AWAY!".

G: And how would that make T feel?

KIDS: Sad. Bad. Sad.

G: Is there another way?

K: Say, "Please T, go away, I want to do it by myself."

Although some kids, like J, were not interested in discussing the videos (especially if the video segments included images of themselves), I believe that the majority of the kids actively engaged in (and enjoyed) the discussions. The videos served as a fine catalyst for intimate discussion, since the videos show the kids images of themselves, or if not themselves, at least their friends and classmates. Moreover, the activities and environment in the videos are ones that the kids were very familiar with. All the videos were shot in the CORE classroom. The videos show children playing games that the kids in the discussion groups had played before. In other words, the kids were reflecting upon concrete situations, activities, and locations that they had participated in, recently. They weren't watching a video about John and Mary ice-skating in New Hampshire. The video are "close to home". Plus, the videos are "close to home" since many of the segments are in Spanish.

THE ROLE OF THE DISCUSSION MODERATOR:

I must mention that the success of the video-discussion is not just dependent on the content and format of the edited tape, and on the participation of the students; in addition, success may greatly depend on the talents of the discussion moderator. Fortunately, Gabriela created a supportive, personal, and caring atmosphere for the kids. She was able to pull kids into the discussion who were at first reluctant to share their thoughts. Furthermore, Gabriela's fluency in both English and Spanish was crucial to the video-discussions; she frequently translated dialogue from the videos, and the kids' questions and responses. Finally, through encouragement and repetition, Gabriela reinforced the lessons of the video-discussions.

A FINAL "GOOD" LESSON:

We discovered the hard way that the video-discussions don't work well in larger groups. On Thursday, May 19, the assistant teacher for CORE class was unable to come to work. Therefore, since Gabriela had to supervise all the kids, it was not possible to take half of the kids to the library for a video-discussion, and leave the other half back in the CORE classroom, unsupervised. So, we decided to conduct a video-discussion with both Group C and Group D, together, in the CORE classroom.

First, by holding the video-discussion in the CORE classroom, it was difficult to separate the kids from the activities and games that they had already started, and that were still in sight. When the kids are usually taken to the library, they cannot continue with the activities that they began while in the CORE classroom. Second, in the larger undivided group, kids who "act-up" together were still together. So, by calling out to eachother, some kids disrupted any chance of maintaining focused discussion. Further, with both Group C and D together, few kids had an opportunity to speak and participate. Thus, the video became more boring to them. In short, with the large group, the discussion didn't work. This unplanned "experiment" convinced me and Gabriela that small, purposefully separated groups are most appropriate for video-discussions.

Interestingly enough, although it was hard to maintain discussion in the larger group, some kids were still interested in viewing the videos, and in grappling with the video's theme. The following excerpt is from the "discussion" with both Groups C and D, concerning "playing together versus fighting":

> G: (after trying hard to conduct a discussion with the video) This isn't really working. It doesn't seem that people want to be here and talk about it. Is that true?
>
> K: I don't want to see the movie.

K: We don't want to talk about them. We just want to see it.

K: We just want to see it.

G: O.K. I'll let you just see it. How's that? (G plays the video, without comment.)

KIDS: (the kids continue the exercise without G.) They're playing. They're playing. They're fighting. Yeah, they're fighting.

Seemingly, the kids were still interested in discerning "playing" from "fighting", on their own.

BEHAVIOR CHANGE?:

This project was designed to explore video's strength as a catalyst for discussion, not video's ability to elicit behavior change. However, if the project lasted longer, and if our research was more "empirical", we might be able to assess the videos' impact on the kids' behavior. Gabriela feels that the video-discussions might have led to some behavior change; in her project evaluation she notes that, after discussing the videos, "some of the older kids [became] more aware of 'fighting' and eagerly helped solve problems. Some did it by saying "Hey, don't fight" or by helping running kids stop and settle down."

Further, in suggesting other uses of video, Gabriela implies that video could lead to behavior change: "[video-discussions] would be useful especially if there was a consistent and recurring problem in the classroom, so that problem could be addressed and solved."

We can't draw many conclusions from these observations; nonetheless, the impact on kids' behavior, as a result of viewing and discussing videos, warrants further research.

PROJECT EVALUATION

During the last week of the EDP program, Gabriela, America, and myself administered brief, basic questionnaires to the students in all the CORE classes, in order to get their feelings and suggestions about the video project. (To see a copy of the questionnaire, refer to page 48.) Some students filled out the questionnaire by themselves. But most dictated their answers to the teachers. The kids usually "took" the questionnaire in pairs or small groups. A total of 32 kids answered questionnaires; thus, the sample is quite small to draw too many conclusions. Nonetheless, some clear patterns did emerge:

First, 69 percent of the students had already seen themselves on video, before my video project.

Second, 84 percent of the kids liked to see themselves on video.

Third, when asked "How do you look on video?", 44 percent circled "Great"; 34 percent circled "So-So"; and 22 percent circled "Not Good".

Fourth, when asked "Did you like making and seeing the videos in class?", 66 percent circled "Yes"; 25 percent circled "So-So"; and 6 percent circled "No".

Fifth, 84 percent of the kids were comfortable when I took the videos.

Sixth, with regard to their favorite video activities, 56 percent preferred to "watch myself"; and 41 percent preferred to "have discussions".

In general, the kids' response to the video project was very positive (as long as we can trust that the kids didn't just give the answers that they thought the teachers would want to hear). More than three-quarters of the kids liked to see themself on video, and felt comfortable as I taped them. Furthermore, almost half of the students preferred to participate in video-discussions, instead of just watching immediate playback of themselves.

The questionnaire suggests that, even though less than half of the kids think that they "look great" on video, almost all the kids like to see themselves on video. (Unfortunately, the questionnaire didn't specify if "looking great" meant physical appearance, behavior, or some combination of both.) Possibly, despite anxieties over self-image, kids still enjoyed viewing the videos of themselves.

Furthermore, when asked questions related to the video-discussions (such as "What happens when people work together?" and "What is the difference between playing rough and fighting?") the kids frequently responded with the same phrases that were often repeated and emphasized during the video-discussions that they participated in. Possibly, the lessons of the video-discussions "stuck".

The sample is too small to make many significant comparisons between the responses of students in grades K-3, and the responses of students in grades 4-6. However, based on the 32 questionnaires (19 students in K-3, and 13 students in 4-6), it seems that the percentage of K-3ers who liked to see themselves on video (89%) was greater than the percentage of 4-6s who liked seeing themselves (77%). Yet, the percentage of K-3ers who felt comfortable being videotaped (79%) was smaller than the percentage of 4-

6ers who felt comfortable (92%). Apparently, even though the K-3ers liked to see themselves more on video, they were not as comfortable being videotaped as the 4-6ers.

A FEW SUGGESTIONS

Through student and teacher project evaluations, I received many fine suggestions for other video-for-education activities. This section will briefly list some of these suggestions. (To see teacher and student evaluation forms and responses, see pages 48-54.)

STUDENT SUGGESTIONS:

Many of the kids suggested that we produce and videotape plays. Some other feasible ideas include making commercials, playing reporter, taping the class playing music, taping a class party, and taping puppet shows.

Only one kid suggested that the students could learn to use the camera to produce their own videos.

A few of the more "abstract" suggestions included: "make people laugh."; "watch other kids that we don't know"; and "show [the videos] to other little kids and tell them what they should and shouldn't do for themselves and others".

One perceptive and frank boy suggested that I stop taping "negative" behavior; he asked me to "cut out the bad things and show only good things so that there isn't any resentment".

TEACHER SUGGESTIONS:

In her project evaluation, Gabriela suggested additional themes for video-discussions. We could make edited tapes concerning student "cultural differences"; and concerning "family groupings" (such as older kids helping younger kids). In addition, Gabriela suggested that we make tapes that focus on specific recurring problems in the classroom. Tapes could even be designed for one-on-one discussions, that address the behavior of specific children.

Like the kids, Gabriela recommends making videos of plays. This interest in plays, on the part of both students and teachers, could be incorporated directly into the video-discussions. The video-discussions could combine role playing, in order to explore feelings, and to reinforce and practice problem solving techniques.

CONCLUSION

In sum, this pilot project in video-pedagogy illustrates that video can serve as a fine catalyst to small group discussions with elementary school children. Furthermore, video-discussions create a dynamic learning context that offers kids the opportunity to view themselves, and to grapple with questions of social relationships and values.

Despite video's potential in education, obstacles still exist to incorporating video into classrooms. Schools don't often have a free graduate student to do the taping. Further, teachers and administrators aren't always as willing to commit their time to planning and discussing "video curriculum". Nor is technical video training often incorporated within teacher training. However, if educators and school administrators become more willing to explore video's potential, then video can emerge as a very valuable and creative pedagogical tool.

RELATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abercrombie, Minnie and Terry, P.M.; Talking to Learn: Improving Teaching and Learning in Small Groups; Guildford, Surrey; Society for Research in Higher Education; 1978.

Allan, Margaret; Teaching English with Video; Essex, England; Longman; 1985.

Boud, David and Margot Pearson; "The Use of Trigger Films as a Stimulus for Affective Learning"; in Video in Higher Education; edited by Ortrun Zuber-Skerritt; New York; Nichols Publishing Company; 1984.

Dowrick, Peter; "Self-Modelling"; in Using Video: Psychological and Social Applications; edited by Peter Dowrick; New York; John Wiley and Sons; 1983.

Dowrick, Peter; Using Video: Psychological and Social Applications; New York; John Wiley and Sons; 1983.

Elliott, Geoff; Video Production in Education and Training; London; Croom Helm; 1984.

Fernandez, Micheal; "Proposal for Extended Day Program: Hoover Elementary School Pilot Program"; Hoover Elementary; RedwoodCity, CA.; 3/25/88.

Geddes, Marion and Sturtridge, Gill; Video in the Language Classroom; London; Heinemann Educational Books; 1982.

Greelis, Michael; ABC's of Video Therapy; Novato, CA.; Academic Therapy Publications; 1980.

Hosford, Ray and Mills, Michael; "Video in Social Skills Training"; in Using Video: Psychological and Social Applications; edited by Peter Dowrick; New York; John Wiley and Sons; 1983.

Kaplan, Don; Video in the Classroom: A Guide to Creative Television; White Plains, New York; Knowledge Industry Publications; 1980.

Kinzer, Harold; "Video Feedback in the Classroom: Possible Consequences for the Communication Apprehensive"; paper for the Western Speech Communication Association; Feb. 1985; (ED 257 168).

Koetting, J. Randall; "Video as a Means for Analyzing Teaching: A Process of Self-Reflection and Critique"; paper presented for Association for Educational Communications and Technology; Jan. 1985; (ED 256 323).

Lewis, Peter; Video in Non-Formal Education: A Bibliographic Study; Paris; UNESCO; 1977.

Zuber-Skerritt, Ortrun; Video in Higher Education; New York; Nichols Publishing Company; 1984.

RELEVANT JOURNALS

Instructional Innovator; Association for Educational Communications and Technology; 1126 16th Street, N.W.; Washington D.C.; 20036.

Media and Methods: Exploration in Education; American Society of Educators; 1511 Walnut Street; Philadelphia, PA.; 19102.

PROJECT CALENDAR

APRIL/MAY 1988

MON	TUES	WED	THURS
25 tape CORE class; no immediate replay	**26** tape CORE class; immediate replay	**27** tape CORE class; immediate replay	**28** tape CORE class; immediate replay
2 tape CORE class; replay 4/25 tape	**3** NOTHING	**4** tape CORE class; no immediate replay	**5** NOTHING
9 edit Tape 1: "working together"	**10** edit Tape 1: "working together"	**11** video-discussion with Tape 1; Group A, then Group B	**12** video-discussion with Tape 1; Group C, then Group D
16 edit Tape 2: "playing vs. fighting"	**17** edit Tape 2: "playing vs. fighting"	**18** video-discussion with Tape 2; Group A, then Group B	**19** video-discussion with Tape 2; Group C and D, together
23 project evaluations	**24** project evaluations	**25** project evaluations	**26** project evaluations

WORKING TOGETHER (WT)
or
NOT WORKING TOGETHER ?

1) **WT:** group playing CHECKERS
2) **NOT WT:** group quarreling over ICEMAN

STOP -- WHEN ARE THEY WT OR NOT-WT?

3) **WT:** group playing SPIROGRAPH ..... **TURNS INTO**
4) **NOT WT:** group fighting over SPIROGRAPH

STOP -- HOW DOES WT BECOME NOT-WT?

5) **WT:** girls making PAPER CHAIN
6) **NOT WT:** boys trying to fold TUMBLING MAT

STOP -- ONCE AGAIN, WT OR NOT-WT?

7) **WT:** group playing with PARACHUTE
8) **NOT WT:** kids fighting over WASHING HANDS

STOP -- WT VERSUS NOT-WT? RESOLUTIONS?

IS IT PLAYING OR IS IT FIGHTING?

1) **PLAYING**: Veronica and girls messing around **(GOOD)**
2) **PLAYING**: James and gang messing around **(GOOD)**

STOP -- ARE THEY PLAYING OR FIGHTING?

3) **PLAYING TURNS TO** .... Girls swinging ..... **(GOOD)**
4) **FIGHTING** Kyle gets pushed out **(BAD?)**

STOP -- HOW DOES PLAYING BECOME FIGHTING?

5) **PLAYING TURNS TO** ... Two boys play-tugging .... **(GOOD)**
6) **FIGHTING** then pulling away **(BAD?)**

STOP -- ONCE AGAIN, PLAYING TO FIGHTING?

7) **PLAYING**: Juan and Tommy **(GOOD?)**
8) **FIGHTING**: Juan and Long **(BAD)**

STOP -- REVIEW!

"SHOOTING DIARY"

FRIDAY: 4/22/88

I met with the Hoover principal Mike Fernandez and the Director of the Extended Day Program (EDP), Gabriela Magana. The meeting was to finalize our plans to proceed with the video project. Mike discussed his reservations about having the videos used for commercial purposes. He also showed me how to use Hoover's 1/2" video camera and recorder.

Then, I met with Gabriela, to discuss how we'll incorporate the video into the EDP classes. She thinks that it will be best for the CORE classes taught by America, since the CORE classes are the most structured.

Gabriela will introduce me to the kids as a friend of herself and America. I am there to take videos of your class, to show them to your class, to talk about the class.

After brainstorming with Gabriela about the possible uses of video, we came up with the following "relations" to explore:

-- student-student, by sex, age, ethnic group
-- Words vs. Actions. Students often complain about doing activities that they obviously (visually) enjoy. (Kids love the bathtub, once their in it.)
-- Older kids are loud, and intimidating to the younger kids.
-- Boys often intimidate the girls
-- teacher-student relations.

The first few days will be primarily observation on my part -- so that I can see the classroom dynamics, and so that the students can get used to me.

I discussed with Gabriela my desire for the teachers to guide my video project. Instead of taking random visual "pot shots", I'd like to take videos around a "theme for the day". The themes should adapt to the teachers' needs.

MONDAY 4/25/88:

I photographed the CORE class, with Gabriela, Betsy, and America. The tape focused on how students work together, while doing drawings, making paper chains, playing games. Some shots concern how some students choose to work alone, or in small groups, whereas others choose to work in large

groups. The video also indicates that girls and boys tend to separate in play.

Many sequences were of a boy named Hector who got into fights. He wandered from station to station, marginally becoming integrated into the groups. He fought with one boy. Then Gabriela came over to confront them. Afterwards, during story reading time, Hector sat alone by the teachers desk. The images show the group involved with the story, as Hector sat alone in the background.

Much of the video shows the artwork of the children. They are very patient and involved with their painting.

I did not show the video to them today. I will do so on the next Monday. When the video is shown to the kids, I am worried about the impact it will have on Hector. Will he feel ostracized? Some key questions about the video concern: 1) How to work together; 2) How to resolve conflicts; 3) How to become involved with individual creative work.

After class, I showed the video back to Gabriela and America. They were able to see much activity that escaped their attention. They saw what was "behind their backs". To them this was very useful. They saw how Hector went from table to table, marginally integrating himself in others' play. The video was able to show that this was a pattern for Hector. America suggests that we show it back to the kids, but that we should omit the very sad shots of Hector being isolated from the group.

All in all, all's well. A fine beginning. Technically, the camera is fine enough, and easy to use.

TUESDAY 4/26/88:

I taped the CORE class, with Maria (a teacher who had just arrived for her second day of work, and didn't know anything about the video project).

The kids were older (4-6 grades), and much more aware of the camera. I taped kids playing together, and separate. Activities included puzzles, marbles, drawing, "break the ice", homework, etc..

Teacher-student interaction is not too interesting, since the classroom in relatively unstructured and easily manageable. The teacher isn't trying to impart knowledge; she is an enlightened "day care worker".

So, most "relations" revolve around childrens' play. How some work intensely alone. How others try to pry their way into other groups. Etc..

Boys tend to stay with boys, and girls with girls. However, at times, they bridge the sexes. "Race", thus far, doesn't seem to be an issue. About 90% are Latino, with a few Blacks, Asians, and Anglos. No clear divisions are drawn. The "minorities" are not ostracized by the Latinos.

I'm beginning to feel that maybe there isn't anything happening to photograph. How many pictures do we need of kids drawing, doing puzzles, playing "break the ice". The video must be incorporated within the class sessions. But for right now, I'd rather that they just get used to seeing themselves, to being comfortable with me.

I showed the class the video of themselves today, in the library. The taped version took only 15 minutes. The kids sat in rows to watch the T.V.. When the tape went on, there was spontaneous talking, laughing, calling out for about 5 minutes. Then Gabriela had them be quiet and watch. She left the room, so that only I was with the kids. We watched without comment. They were amazed to look at themselves. Nervous laughter. Some hid their faces when they say themselves. They kept calling out "Hey look at so and so".

At one point I stopped the tape to show how Edwin tried to find company to do a puzzle with. After two failed attempts, he took out a puzzle and did it himself. I pointed this out. The other kids had no response. Edwin was a bit embarrassed.

After the showing, I asked them what it was like to see themselves. Everyone laughs. Some had seem themselves before on video (about 1/2 the class). When I asked, generally, what did you learn about your class, there were no replies. They questions must be more directed. I hope that they'll want to see videos of themselves again. I think that it may be uncomfortable , and exciting, for them.

Two ideas make sense to explore: 1) show videos of class "X" to class "Y"; and 2) have America direct questioning; and 3) film the next classes <u>first</u> reaction to the video.

All in all, it went O.K.. I have doubts about whether this context makes sense for a video-pedagogy exercise. But then again, when things seem tough, that's the time to keep on.

WEDNESDAY 4/27/88:

I taped the CORE class with America and Betsy. Many of the kids were also in the CORE class yesterday.

Basically, the tapes were much of the same. I tried to get good images of each kid, so they could see themselves -- drawing, playing.

As usual, some work alone while others work in groups. Everyone was pretty mellow. James and another boy are camera hams. They are very conscious of where the camera is at all times. They always act when the camera comes near. Except, James and I did a mini-news broadcast on AIDS that has a bit of potential.

After the class, we viewed the video in the library. The reaction was laughter. But not as loud or nervous as yesterday's class. My feeling is that the level of laughter, nervousness, etc. has to do with 1) seeing themselves on the video, and 2) the chemistry of the particular groups. Wednesday's group was much more comfortable with the video.

America asked them how it feels to see themselves. Some liked it. One boy commented that he likes some things about it and not others. When I asked him "What did he like, and what did he not like", he couldn't articulate his response. It is tough to elicit discussion of the tapes. Then, America asked if they want to see themselves again, another day. The response was mixed. But when America asked if they want to have me videotape a play of theirs, they all said yes. So, possibly, they like video when it is used as part of an activity, a "fiction", rather than as capturing their reality.

I tried to shoot their responses to seeing themselves on video for the first time (which it was for many). However, it was hard to become "indiscreet" about this activity. The kids looked at me, not at the videos of themselves. So, I didn't push it.

Ideas for next week include: 1) showing one class to another; 2) showing edited excerpts; and 3) using video within activities (i.e. dramas, newscasts, etc..)

THURSDAY 4/28/88:

Well, thank-God the week is over. Quite draining. Today I taped the CORE class with America. Much of the same. Kids playing -- drawing, spirograph, "break the ice", paper cutting, etc.. Today's class was pretty disruptive due

to Tommy and Jimmy's constant fights. They were quite loud. Neither could get involved with their own work. I recorded their interactions, and America scolding them.

Mostly, I went for shots of each kid, so they could see themselves in a "good light".

We viewed the video in the library. Jimmy didn't want to see it, knowing that he was caught fighting, on tape. It was hard to get the kids together. I didn't get much cooperation from Gariela or America. Everyone had the end of the week blues. Finally we rounded the kids up -- all except for Tommy -- who needed to see the video most.

I showed it to them without another teacher present. As usual, the response was nervous laughter. Some guys kept wrestling and yelling throughout the showing, making it difficult for the girls to watch. Tommy and Jimmy thought that the scenes of them fighting were cool. The girls were embarrassed when the viewed their interviews with eachother -- the questions they asked were: What are you doing? What's your favorite color? Who's your boyfriend? Etc.?

After viewing the video, the kids were up and ready to run out the door. I couldn't keep them to start a conversation.

All in all, I think that the large group viewing prohibits any type of conversation to ensue. A few students monopolize the comments, and don't give others (especially the girls) a chance to quietly deal with it. Maybe small groups will work.

This week enabled children to see themselves. That's it. What impact does just "seeing oneself" have? I can't tell... yet.

Gabriela and America don't have other ideas for next week. The policeman is coming on Monday. Then a dentist. Etc.. So, without their input and enthusiasm, I'm not sure where it will go. It doesn't make sense to just do another week of the same.

Gabriela took the tape home for the weekend. Maybe it will be a pedagogical tool for teachers, by and large. The kids may be too young to reflect on what's going on. It may make sense to try a high school before the quarter ends.

MONDAY 5/2/88:

Once again, I taped CORE class. Not much is happening there. More of the same.

Amy was very interested in doing interviews with other students. Questions were very superficial: What's your favorite color? What's your favorite book? What's do you like to play? Kids were nervous being interviewed. When in a formal relationship the kids clam-up. This is opposite of adults. We need the formal relationship in order to communicate. Kids need freedom to communicate. ("Colleagues" can relate around the conference table, but not around the dinner table.)

I replayed the tape from last Monday (the first video made) to the kids and teachers. There wasn't the same excitement as when I showed back the tapes shot on the same day they are shown. But still, lots of nervous laughter.

I gave the tapes to Gabriela to view on her own.

WEDNESDAY 5/4/88:

I taped the opening half-hour and then started to tape the CORE class. America had planned to have students act out the story of "La Llorona", for the camera; but the kids weren't into it.

So, I left for awhile and taped the outdoor games. The kids were playing with a colorful parachute, which made for great pictures -- but not much "relationship analysis".

Then I returned to CORE to tape again. I tried to focus more on teachers than on students. Lots of caring. But also, lots of trouble -- especially with messy chalk drawings.

Gabriela, America, and Betsy planned the last three weeks of the CORE class. They have incorporated the video into CORE class skits that will be taped and then shown to all the students, together.

I did not show the video back to the class today. I'm waiting to talk with Gabriela, to get some more direction, feedback, etc.

EXCERPTS FROM VIDEO-DISCUSSIONS

What follows are excerpts from the video discussions conducted by the EDP director, Gabriela, with small groups of kids. In the following dialogues, a "K" is used to indicate when <u>any</u> "kid" in the group is speaking. Unless it is necessary for the understanding of the dialogue, the kid who is speaking will not be identified.

WEDNESDAY 5/11/88: WORKING TOGETHER (WT) VERSUS NOT WT

<u>GROUP A:</u>
(5 kids, grades 4-6)

<u>Tape 1; Pair 1: Checkers versus Iceman</u>

Gabriela (G): (G shows Checkers and Iceman segments.) What happened in the first one? (G shows Checkers segment again.)

Kid (K): There they are sharing

G: Was everyone playing checkers? Were they all happy? (G tries to discuss how some children can learn from watching others. This discussion didn't catch on. G does on to show Iceman segment again.)

G: What could they have done differently here?

K: Let Jimmy play too. (Many kids jump in and tell different versions of what happened.)

K: Jimmy could have waited.

K: They could have fought.

G: Yes, but how would that make you feel [to fight]?

K: Bad.

<u>Tape 1; Pair 3: Making Paper Chain versus Folding Tumbling Mat</u>

G: (G shows the segments of two girls making a paper chain and then two boys, "T" and "J", folding a tumbling mat.) What happened in the first one?

K: They're sharing. The two together are making a chain.

G: How do they feel?

K: Happy.

K: T didn't want to help.

G: (G shows the tumbling mat segment again.) Were they working together? Did T learn to fold the mat?

K: T wasn't sharing.

G: What could T have done differently to make it work better?

K: He could have listened to what J said.

Tape 1: Pair 4: Washing Hands

G: What happened when everyone wanted to wash at once?

K: They got mad.

G: What could they have done different?

K: Waited.

G: And if it's hard to wait?

K: One person could hold the water for another to wash their hands.

Tape 1: Discussion Wrap-Up

G: We saw kids working together and not working together. What happens when people work together?

K: They accomplish more.

K: They feel good.

K: They share.

G: And when they don't work together?

K: They get mad.

G: If people are not working together, how could you help change it?

K: Listening.

G: Could you help correct a situation?

K: Maybe. They might get mad and tell their brother to beat me up.

G: If that happened what could you do?

K: Tell my brother or mother.

G: Any other ideas?

KIDS: (silence)

G: Well, you all worked very well together in watching and discussing the video.

GROUP B:
(5 kids, grades 4-6)

Tape 1; Pair 1: Iceman

G: (G replays iceman segment.) What happened? What could they have done differently to make it better?

K: Waited turns.

K: Pick numbers.

K: Flip a coin.

G: What else besides take turns?

K: Shared.

G: How do you think T and J feel in the video?

K: Sad.

K: Bad.

G: How could they solve their problem?

KIDS: (silence)

G: By using their words instead of hitting and grabbing.

Tape 1: Pair 4: Washing Hands

G: (G replays segment of children fighting over water faucet.) How could they have worked together?

K: Shared the soap.

K: Help someone get a towel.

G: (G replays segment.) What else to make it better?

K: They could say "excuse me". Get in line.

Tape 1: Discussion Wrap-Up

G: What could you do to help when people are not working together?

K: Talk to them.

G: What would you say? How could you help?

KIDS: (silence)

G: What happens when people work together?

K: They have fun.

K: Accomplish their goal.

K: Get more done.

G: Another way we worked together was by all sharing ideas.

THURSDAY 5/12/88: WT VERSUS NOT WT

GROUP C:
(5 kids, grades K-3)

Tape 1; Pair 1: Checkers versus Iceman

G: We're going to see children playing together and not playing together. Look at their faces. Think about how they're feeling. (G shows first two segments.)

G: Who was playing? Want to see it again? (G replays Checkers segment.)

K: Happy!

K: Playing checkers.

G: Were people having fun?

KIDS: Yeah! Yeah!

G: What were they feeling? "J", how were you feeling? ("J" is in the Checkers segment.)

J: Happy.

G: (G replays the next segment, Iceman, in which J is aggressively trying to enter into a game, unsuccesfully.) What happened?

K: T said, "I'm gonna beat you up!".

K: I said, "I'm gonna beat you up!"

G: No, T said it. Let see. Watch carefully. (G replays Iceman segment.) Look at how they're playing. Were they happy?

KIDS: NO. NO. NO.

G: Were people playing together?

KIDS: NO. NO. NO.

K: They were fighting.

G: Why were they fighting?

K: They all wanted to play "the ice".

K: They could have waited.

K: They could play something else.

K: Take turns.

G: If you were there, what would you have said?

K: I don't know.

G: Were they sharing the hammers?

KIDS: NO. NO.

G: J, it's important that you join us in our discussion.

Tape 1; Pair 2: Spirograph

G: (G plays the spirograph segments.) What happened?

M: (M, H, and A are all in the spirograph video segments.) She took mine, then H took it, but I was using it. (nervous laugh.)

H: I was letting her borrow it.

A: Because H was using hers.

G: Were you guys working together?

H: Not really.

G: I'll play it again. Look closely to tell when you're working together and not working together. See if you can notice the difference. (G replays the first segment, when they're working together.)

G: So right there, what was happening? Are you working together?

M: In the first part "yeah", but later on "no".

G: Then are you working together?

M, H, and A: (together) Yeah. No. Yeah.

G: Want to see the rest of it? (G replays second Spirograph segment, when the girls aren't working together.) What happened there?

M: We were all fighting for the same thing.

G: What could you have done different?

K: Sharing.

K: Wait for someone to finish and then give it to them.

Tape 1: Pair 3: Folding Tumbling Mat

G: What's J trying to do?

K: Fold it up.

G: What's T doing?

K: Helping.

G: Is he helping?

KIDS: No he's not. No. No.

G: Let's watch. (G replays segment.)

K: He's not helping right now.

G: Are they having a good time?

KIDS: Nope. No. No.

K: T wasn't helping J.

G: What could T have done differently?

J: Go away.

G: (to J) How could you have gotten T to go away?

J: Say, "GO AWAY!".

G: And how would that make T feel?

KIDS: Sad. Bad. Sad.

G: Is there another way?

K: Say, "Please T, go away, I want to do it by myself."

K: Or ask him to stand back.

Tape 1: Discussion Wrap-Up

G: What happens when people don't work together?

K: They quit their jobs.

K: Get in fights.

K: Say bad words.

G: How do they feel?

KIDS: Sad. Sad. Bad.

G: And when they work together?

KIDS: Share. Happy.

J: I want to go.

G: If you saw a problem could you help to make it better? What could you do?

J: Stop the fight.

GROUP D:
(5 kids, grades K-3)

Tape 1; Pair 1: Checkers versus Iceman

G: (G replays the Checkers segment.) What were the others doing?
K: Watching.

G: How were they feeling?

K: Happy.

G: Now we'll see the second one (Iceman). Look carefully and listen to what people are saying to eachother. Look at what they're doing. (G replays the Iceman segment.) Are they working together or not working together?

K: No. They're not playing together.

K: They were fighting for the game.

K: They were arguing.

WEDNESDAY 5/18/88: PLAYING ROUGH VERSUS FIGHTING

GROUP A:
(4 kids, grades 4-6)

Tape 2; Pair 2: Swinging turns to Pushing

KIDS: (all explaining the action.)

G: How did it start? O.K.?

K: Yeah. Dancing.

G: Then how did it go? They started out playing ....

K: And they ended up fighting

G: Why did that happen?

K: One of them disagrees.

Tape 2: Pair 4: J and T, then, J and L

G: (G plays both segments.) Playing of fighting?

KIDS: Playing. Fighting. Playing.

G: Look at peoples' faces to tell what's going on. (G replays first segment, J and T making fists at eachother.)

K: T was smiling, but J had a mad face.

G: Let's see it again. (G replays J and T segment.)

K: T was laughing, but J wasn't having fun. J was getting annoyed.

G: Were both having fun?

K: One was.

G: Was the other.

K: No.

G: How could you tell.

K: Their facial expressions.

Tape 2: Discussion Wrap-Up

G: Is some of these [segments] we say fighting. But some were playing. It's hard to tell the difference sometimes. How can you tell the difference?

K: Facial expressions.

K: The way they use their hands.

K: Sometimes it looks like they are laughing, but they are really angry.

K: When playing you are happy. When fighting you are scared. You don't know why the other wants to fight you.

G: (G rewinds and replays the whole tape, as kids point out "playing" and "fighting" in each segment.) What can you do if you start playing and then its not fun anymore, it starts to turn into fighting?

K: Tell the person not to do it. If that doesn't work, go tell the teacher.

K: Go away from him.

GROUP B:
(6 kids, grades 4-6)

Tape 2: Pair 2: Swinging turns to Pushing

G: How did it start?

K: It was playing, and then someone else joined in, and then it was fighting?

G: L, you were there. What happened?

L: Fighting at the end.

G: How could you tell they were fighting?

K: People weren't enjoying it. They didn't want to be in it.

Tape 2: Pair 2: J and T, then, J and L

G: (G plays first segment, of J and T.) What did their faces look like?

K: One was happy and one was sad.

G: So are they playing or fighting?

K: One was having fun and the other one wasn't.

G: (G plays the second segment of J pushing L.) What's happening with J and L?

KIDS: Fighting. Fighting.

K: No, they're just pushing.

G: What tells you if kids are playing or fighting?

K: On their face.

K: Tone of voice.

G: (Replays most of the segments.) If you start playing and it turns into a fight, what can you do?

K: Stop it.

G: How?

K: Get away from them.

K: Hold them down.

K: Tell the teacher.

K: Say, "No fighting!"

THURSDAY 5/19/88: PLAYING ROUGH VERSUS FIGHTING

GROUP C and D:

(all 10 kids at once, since one teacher was absent, and thus the class couldn't be split up; grades K-3.)

G: (after trying hard to conduct a discussion with the video) This isn't really working. It doesn't seem that people want to be here and talk about it. Is that true?

K: I don't want to see the movie.

K: We don't want to talk about them. We just want to see it.

K: We just want to see it.

G: O.K. I'll let you just see it. How's that? (G plays the video, without comment.)

KIDS: (the kids continue the exercise without G.) They're playing. They're playing. They're fighting. Yeah, they're fighting.

WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THE VIDEOS?

1) **BOY** or **GIRL** 2) **GRADE** _____ 3) **AGE** _____

4) Before seeing Phil's videos, had you seen yourself on video before?

YES **NO**

5) Do you like to see yourself on video?

YES **NO**

6) How do you look on video?

GREAT **OKAY** **NOT GOOD**

7) Did you like making and seeing videos in the class?

YES **SO-SO** **NO**

8) Were you comfortable when Phil took the videos?

YES **SO-SO** **NO**

9) What were your favorite things to do with the videos?

WATCH MYSELF **HAVE DISCUSSIONS**

10) What other things could we do with the videos?

11) When we discussed the videos, what was interesting to you?

12) What happens when people work together?

13) What is the difference between playing rough and fighting?

14) What advice would you give Phil, if he does another video project?

SOME RESPONSES TO STUDENT PROJECT EVALUATIONS

10) What other things could we do with the videos?

make plays; videos of us playing; reporting; see cartoons; movies; doing exercise; make commercials; tape race cars; sports; tape other school activities; tape a party; tape music; tape everyone; puppets;

"tape other things besides Core -- math, outdoor games, arts and crafts"
"let someone else use them"
"see them"
"take the video myself"
"Make people laugh. Watch other kids of things that we don't know"
"tape more of my friend"
"you could show them to other little kids and tell them what they should and shouldn't do for themselves and others"

11) When we discussed the videos, what was interesting to you?

"the way the people acted when they saw the camera"
"when Gabriela asked the questions"
"when they played together"
"when they were cooperating"
"sharing"
"like the one where it looks like they're fighting when they're playing"
"paintings to get better"
"see myself, see the videos -- I like them all"
"seeing other people the way they act"
"it is fun"
"when the kids make funny faces or do funny things"
"when I was painting"
"when everyone laughed at me, it was silly what I did"
"to see myself painting"

12) What happens when people work together?

"don't know"
"get a lot of things done"
"feel happy"

"things are better"
"we had alot of fun"
"it's quieter"
"everything goes OK"
"play well"
"we play together"
"they help eachother"
"they get stuff done"
"they make teamwork, stuff get done"
"they talk"
"its not good to fight with people, its better to make friends"
"all turns our well; everything gets finished; there aren't fights"
"they accomplish more"
"they are working together"
"they are sharing"
"they play well, they don't fight"
"they do all the work well; they don't play alone"
"they get money, they are helping eachother"
"they become friends"
"they don't get mad, they're happy"
"they aren't mad"

13) What is the difference between playing rough and fighting?

"don't know"
"they are happy when they are playing"
"when they tell the teacher"
"they got hurt eachother when they get angry.When you play you laugh"
"can hurt yourself"
"play wrestle not trying to hurt eachother when play you laugh"
"playing rough you don't get hurt alot, when you are fighting you get hurt"
"they say bad words, they fight"
"hit eachother"
"when they look more serious"
"if I pull the shirt of a friend, he knows that I'm fighting"
"afraid"
"how serious you are"
"fighting is serious sometimes"
"fighting"
"it's quieter"
"the difference is fighting"
"happy (playing rough), sad (fighting)"
"its looks like they're playing when they're really fighting"

"when someone is hitting they're fighting"
"when they fight they hit hard"
"they see in their faces that they are upset"
"when they molest you they want to fight"
"when they look happy, they are playing"
"of their face"
"fighting you can hurt yourself more than just playing rough"
"they don't hit hard, or talk bad"

14) What advice would you give Phil, if he does another video project?

"I like to play with Felipe. I like to take films of us"
"play games and tape games"
"do it with nobody noticing"
"we can do a play together"
"you're doing great and the videos are perfect"
"tell him to get more people into it"
"tell him to get more people and make a good play"
"doing a good play on a video"
"let me do it, just kidding"
"thanks, please do it better"
"yeah, make it"
"tell the kids not to fight"
"just stay still and watch"
"change boys; do it better"
"do it the same"
"to keep up the good work"
"cut out the bad things and show only good things so that there isn't any resentment"

(filled out by GABRIELA MAGANA; Director of the Extended Day Program at Hoover Elementary)

VIDEO PROJECT EVALUATION

EDP BASICS:

1) How many children are in EDP? *69 enrolled*

2) What is the ethnic break-up of EDP children? Percent Mexican? Mexican -American? Black? *5* White? *5* Oriental? *5* Recent Immigrants? *No clue. 55 children are Hispanic. I have no clue which of these 55 are Mexican or Mex-American. (21 of these 55 speak English fairly well.)*

3) Are EDP children representative of the larger student body? Or, do EDP children represent specific scholastic or socio-economic characteristics?

I am not aware of the entire student body. (The principal would know better.)

4) Why do parents and children sign-up for EDP?

I think because if offers children a variety of activities when normally they'd just be at home unsupervised.

VIDEO PROJECT (GENERAL):

-- Before this video project, had you used video in your teaching before? Explain.

NO. However, once I interviewed for a job without having seen the program running. Instead I watched a video of the program and got to see how the class ran.

-- What did you learn about yourself by watching the videos? *N/A*

-- What did you learn about the children? *(program)?*

How to improve the daily schedule, how to correct problems I saw, etc.

-- Did the video project impact on classroom dynamics? On your behavior? On the children's behavior? *N/A*

VIDEO AS A TEACHING TOOL:

-- How did immediate playback of the videos serve as a teaching tool?

To allow the children to see their actions on tape immediately and help them find other alternatives (rather than slugging it out) to problem-solving.

-- How did the video-discussions serve as a teaching tool?

To visually teach them the two concepts discussed.

-- Did the video-discussions create a new learning context? Explain.

Yes -- it allowed them to discuss problem-solving techniques when they were calm (instead of being in the heat of the problem).

-- Did the edited segments work to facilitate discussion on "working together"?

Yes -- it was nice to have lots of specific segments pertaining to one topic.

-- Did the edited segments function to facilitate discussion on "playing versus fighting? *Yes.*

-- What other topics could be explored through video-discussions?

**cultural differences*
** family groupings (eg older kids helping younger ones)*

-- What other ways could video be used as a teaching tool?

**doing plays (theatre); giving directions using video.*

-- Would you use video again as a teaching tool? Why? Why not?

Yes. It would be useful especially if there was a consistent and recurring problem in the classroom, so that problem could be addressed and solved.

WRAP UP:

-- What obstacles exist to incorporating video into classrooms?

** getting someone to tape it.*
** possible disrupting of the children's attention.*
** TIME: teachers have to be willing to take time to plan and discuss video "curriculum".*

-- In what ways could the video project have been improved?

**hidden camera (Smile! you're on candid camera!)*

-- As a result of the video-discussions, did you notice any behavior changes among the students?

Yes! Some of the older kids were more aware of "fighting" and eagerly helped solve problems. Some did it by saying "Hey, don't fight" or by helping running kids stop and settle down.

-- What conclusions could you draw from this video-project?

** ENTERTAINMENT: It was a fun tool to use for the kids and most of the kids liked seeing them.*

** It was a nice way to teach them concepts about working together, playing, fighting, etc..*

-- Other comments, interests, concerns, hopes, suggestions, etc.?

Good luck on your paper!